

down vote on Justice Priscilla Owen. Justice Owen has been elected by the people of Texas to the State Supreme Court two times, the second time in the year 2000 with an overwhelming popular majority. During her last election, Justice Owen was endorsed by every major newspaper in the State of Texas.

Mr. C. Boyden Gray, writing an article about this, said: "The members of the Texas legal community know Justice Owen to be a jurist of the highest integrity, one who is committed to following the law, no matter where it leads."

The Dallas Morning News editorialized after she was nominated 4 years ago that "Justice Owen's lifelong record is one of accomplishment and integrity. She is one of the few judicial nominees to receive the unanimous 'well-qualified' rating from the American Bar Association."

The chairman of the Texas Commission on Judicial Efficiency, Baylor University President Herbert Reynolds, said, "Based on my knowledge of Justice Owen for the past 30 years, I believe you simply cannot make a more solid choice for the 5th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals."

I urge the other body to have an up-or-down vote.

RECOGNIZING THE 216TH ENGINEER BATTALION OF THE OHIO NATIONAL GUARD

(Mr. NEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 216th Engineer Battalion of the Ohio National Guard stationed in Chillicothe, Ohio, for their exceptional service during the war on terror.

The 216th completed more than 350 successful missions. They played a critical role in the construction of protective barriers to protect soldiers from enemy fire. And in preparation for Iraq's national election on January 30, the 216th placed concrete barriers at hundreds of voting sites to allow Iraqis to vote in a safe and secure environment. However, their service was not without tragedy. Twenty soldiers of the 216th were awarded Purple Hearts for wounds they received in combat, and three soldiers made the ultimate sacrifice.

In recognition of their exceptionally meritorious conduct, the 216th will be awarded the Meritorious Unit Commendation during their Freedom Salute Campaign celebration next month.

It is with great honor that I have the privilege of recognizing them today. The willingness to risk one's life in defense of the ideals our country was built upon and is the truest test of one's strength and character.

These men and women have excelled as patriots, and we are forever in their debt.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2360, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 278 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 278

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2360) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived except as follows: beginning with the colon on page 6, line 8, through "Office" on page 7, line 7; beginning with "of" on page 7, line 17, through the semicolon on line 23; beginning with the colon on page 8, line 19, through "108-541" on page 9, line 15; beginning with the colon on page 9, line 23, through "checkpoint" on page 10, line 3; beginning with the colon on page 10, line 9, through "Office" on page 11, line 6; beginning with the colon on page 11, line 24, through "Representatives" on page 12, line 7; beginning with the colon on page 17, line 2, through "intent" on line 11; page 17, lines 21 through 24; beginning with the colon on page 18, line 5, through "Act" on line 18; beginning with the colon on page 21, line 2, through "assets" on page 22, line 12; beginning with the comma on page 26, line 22, through "law" on line 23; beginning with the colon on page 27, line 2, through "funds" on page 27, line 13; page 27, line 19, through page 28, line 5; beginning with the colon on page 28, line 15, through "funds" on page 29, line 2; beginning with the colon on page 29, line 6, through "2005" on page 30, line 8; beginning with the comma on page 36, line 19, through "funds" on line 22; and sections 507, 512, 515, 517, 518, 522, 523, 524, 525, 527, 529, 530, 532, and 534. Where points of order are waived against part of a paragraph or section, points of order against a provision in another part of such paragraph or section may be made only against such provision and not against the entire paragraph or section. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

□ 1030

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). The gentleman

from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Madam Speaker, the rule before us today is a fair and completely open rule that provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member on the Committee on Appropriations.

It waives all points of order against consideration of the bill, and provides that under the rules of the House the bill shall be read for amendment by paragraph. It waives points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI, which prohibits unauthorized appropriations or legislative provisions in an appropriations bill except as specified in the resolution.

Finally, the rule authorizes the Chair to accord priority in recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and provides for one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this rule and the underlying legislation. This bill, sponsored by my friend, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Homeland Security, funds an array of Federal programs aimed at securing the Nation against terrorist attacks, including Customs and border protection, transportation security, and Federal assistance to State and local first responders.

In addition, it funds some additional and vitally important missions of agencies that were included in the Democratic of Homeland Security when it was formed 2 years ago, such as disaster relief. This carefully considered legislation provides almost \$31 billion for operations and activities of the Department of Homeland Security, an increase of \$1.37 billion above fiscal year 2005 enacted levels, excluding \$2.5 billion in advance appropriations for BioShield and \$1.3 billion above the President's request.

It also provides \$1 billion in mandatory budget authority for programs in the Department. Some of the other initiatives that the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the chairman, and his subcommittee have funded through this bill on behalf of the American public include: \$7.5 billion to the Coast Guard, who are called today to defend our coast from the threat of terrorism;

\$6.9 billion for the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection, including \$4.9 billion for enforcement activities and assets; \$458 million for computer automated import and export tracking

functions; \$348 million for maintenance of air and marine vessels; and \$93 million for facilities construction and maintenance;

\$5.7 billion for the Transportation Security Administration, including \$2.5 billion for aviation, passenger and baggage screening; \$983 million for aviation security direction and enforcement; and \$36 million for surface transportation security;

\$4.5 billion for the Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement, including \$3.1 billion for immigration enforcement, detention and removal; and \$699 million for Federal air marshals;

\$3.6 billion overall for terrorism preparedness grants, including \$750 million for formula-based grants to States; \$1.2 billion in discretionary grants for high-threat urban ports, port security and public transportation security; \$600 million for fire prevention and control grants; \$200 million for training exercises and technical assistance grants; and \$180 million for emergency management performance grants;

\$3 billion for emergency preparedness and response, including \$2 billion for disaster relief; \$861 million for information analysis and infrastructure protection; and \$422 million for the Office of the Under Secretary for Border and Transportation Security, including \$390 million for the United States Visitor and Immigrant Status Indicator Technology known as US-VISIT program; \$14 million for the NEXUS/SENTRI program; and \$7 million for the free and secure trade programs.

In addition to providing these much needed funds throughout this legislation, the gentleman from Kentucky (Chairman ROGERS) and his committee have also focused sharply on the need for strong oversight and Congressional review of how the taxpayers' money is being spent wisely and efficiently on homeland security.

This much needed emphasis on oversight of the efficiency and effectiveness on how money is spent on defending our homeland will ensure that the money is spent wisely. It will also limit waste and abuse so that the programs that are truly needed to protect the safety of American citizens will have the funds when they are needed and the ability to operate those plans.

Madam Speaker, I strongly support this legislation and this open rule. I commend my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee for their hard work in developing this legislative product.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. McGOVERN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Madam Speaker, the Homeland Security Appropriations bill is one of the

most important bills this or any Congress will consider. The protections provided in this bill are designed to make our country safer and to prevent future terrorist acts from taking place inside the United States.

The Homeland Security Appropriations Subcommittee has a difficult job. The gentleman from Kentucky (Chairman ROGERS) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO), have done the best they could with the limited resources provided to them. While I do not agree with every choice they made, they certainly have my appreciation and gratitude for the job that they have done.

Nonetheless, Madam Speaker, I am very concerned with the inadequate funding levels provided to the Appropriations Committee and with the continuing lack of accountability on the part of the Bush administration.

Now, let us not kid ourselves today. Congress must provide more funding to protect our Nation from terrorist attacks. We should not be forced to choose among funding port security, air security, border security and first responders. These distinct areas of security are all necessary parts of an integrated whole, and none of them should be short-changed. But the reality is that the reckless fiscal policies enacted by the Bush administration and the Republican leadership in Congress are short-changing these and other important programs.

The tax cuts enacted over the last 5 years, coupled with the hundreds of billions of dollars spent on the war in Iraq, have drained the Federal Treasury to the point where even the fire grants that help our local fire departments prepare for the challenges they face every day will be severely cut in this bill.

Madam Speaker, that is the wrong choice. Many of my Republican friends will claim that the Homeland Security Appropriations Subcommittee did the best they could with the allocation provided to them. That argument does not tell the whole truth. Many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will try to have it both ways. They want to criticize the low funding level in this bill, but they do not want to criticize the fiscal policies that have put us in the hole we are in today.

I know that my colleagues on the Homeland Security Appropriations Subcommittee will describe this bill in more detail, but I want to highlight a few key programs.

Again, I am disappointed that this bill short-changes the fire grant program. It is one of the most successful programs in the country and it deserves to be increased and not cut.

I am also disappointed that this bill fails to live up to the promises made in the Intelligence Reform Act, enacted just in December. This bill short-changes border security, a key component of the 9/11 Commission report that was released last year.

The silver lining, thin as it is, Madam Speaker, is that the gentleman

from Kentucky (Chairman ROGERS) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO), were able to increase some funding for port security and transit security, and I am pleased that this bill also directs the Homeland Security Department to take concrete actions to protect this country.

For too long the administration has refused to hold the Department of Homeland Security accountable for its actions, and the gentleman from Kentucky (Chairman ROGERS) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO), included provisions to make the Department accountable, and to provide the necessary oversight of the Department that has been lacking since its creation.

For example, this bill will impose penalties on the TSA Administrator if a requirement to increase the screening of air cargo is not implemented by the end of the fiscal year.

Madam Speaker, for too long the Bush administration has refused to provide general oversight on the Department of Homeland Security. This fits the pattern of a complete lack of accountability on the part of this administration. From the Education Department paying for its own propaganda with taxpayer funds, to the absence of weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, to the wasting of billions of dollars in Iraqi reconstruction contracts, this administration has made mistake after mistake after mistake.

Yet the Republican Congress does not want to do anything. Ask no question, demand no answers. Under this Republican leadership, the legislative branch of government is barely a twig. And so, Madam Speaker, we see the same things happening in the Department of Homeland Security. After publicly supporting a dramatic increase in the number of air marshals, the last two Bush budgets actually proposed cuts in funding for this important program.

Yesterday at the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Kentucky (Chairman ROGERS) testified at length how the Coast Guard refuses to provide detailed plans for their Deepwater program and how the only way to get their attention is to withhold funds for this program. The same is true with the TSA's implementation of cargo screening measures and the deployment of explosive detection technologies at airports around the country.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased that this bill attempts finally to force some kind of accountability from the administration.

But, finally, Madam Speaker, I want to say something about the rule today. I am pleased that it is an open rule. There have been 30 rules considered so far this year, and only three of those rules have been open. That is a batting average of 100, which will get you kicked off of any self-respecting Little League team. This is no way to run the people's House.

I am also disappointed with the way this rule jeopardizes much of the oversight language written by this bill, by exposing it to points of order. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) worked in a bipartisan way, as they should on an issue like this. This rule undercuts that bipartisanship.

Madam Speaker, for the past 3 years the Homeland Security Appropriations Subcommittee has been this body's only source of oversight of the Department of Homeland Security. Earlier this year the Committee on Homeland Security was established. This committee just reported out its first authorization bill, which will be considered later this week.

Madam Speaker, it is not good policy to strip out the oversight language provided by the gentleman from Kentucky (Chairman ROGERS) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO), because of a turf fight between two committees.

□ 1045

The Committee on Homeland Security will have a chance to bring forth its bill this week, and in the future I hope will provide the necessary oversight of the Department so that the Committee on Appropriations does not have to do two jobs; but we should not strike this language from this bill today just because the authorizing committee is unhappy. To do so would be irresponsible, and that is why the rule today should be defeated.

I would say to my friends, especially on the other side of the aisle, that it is a little bit frustrating to hear them talk about accountability on one hand and to support a rule that strips all the accountability from this bill.

We heard last night in the Committee on Rules of the fact that the Homeland Security Department has failed to provide Congress with required reports. We have heard about how deadlines have been missed, one after another. There needs to be accountability.

It is clear that this bill, if this rule passes, does not hold up to that standard of accountability, and I would like to think that the Members of Congress, since we had a role in creating this agency, would want to hold this committee accountable.

This is about our safety. This is about protecting the people of this country, and it is clear that we need to rein in the people over at the Department of Homeland Security.

So, Madam Speaker, I would say in closing that I have great respect for the gentleman from Kentucky (Chairman ROGERS) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Ranking Member SABO). I think they provided the Committee on Rules last night with a good bill that had some teeth in it, that would hold the Department of Homeland Security accountable, but apparently, the Committee on Rules last night decided to just throw all that away.

So I would urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, the opportunity to be here on behalf of this rule today, as my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), points out, is all taking place as a result of the hard work that took place not only between the gentleman from Kentucky (Chairman ROGERS) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Ranking Member SABO); but, really, it was from a lot of work that has taken place over a long period of time, working with the administration, working with the Homeland Security Department.

I must confess that I believe that we should have stronger oversight. I think we agreed on that last night in the Committee on Rules. We are also of the belief that the new leadership at homeland security will continue in this very important task of working with not only the administration but working with our appropriators, our authorizers, the people who are very interested in making sure that we move in a collaborative effort forward for homeland security.

So I am proud of what the bill is today. I think that what the subcommittee did was good work. We are going to get it on the floor today. We are going to debate it. We are going to make it better, and I am proud of the progress that we are making.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Well, I appreciate my colleague from Texas talking about the fact this is a good bill. I agree with him. If it is such a good bill, why did the Committee on Rules allow half the bill to be stripped out?

During the testimony before the Committee on Rules, I think everybody, Democrat and Republican, on that committee praised the work of the gentleman from Kentucky (Chairman ROGERS) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Ranking Member SABO) and talked about the fact that we do need to hold the Department of Homeland Security accountable. I did not hear any dissension during the discussion in the Committee on Rules, and we also think it was a good bill.

Yet, here we are with a rule that would basically strip half of the most important provisions out of the bill. I do not think that is very responsible.

Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, whoever designed this proposition today is a real piece of work.

This is the bill that was submitted to the Committee on Rules last night, a perfectly coherent bill. I had already

indicated my intentions to support the Republican chairman's effort. I thought he did a reasonable job, even though he had inadequate resources.

This is the bill after the Committee on Rules has gotten done with it. Look at this. The Committee has shredded the document that we are supposed to take seriously when we come to this floor and debate it today. It is eviscerated.

I do not understand the majority leadership in this House. Earlier this year, I was asked if I would work out a process which would enable the majority to pass its appropriation bills in a timely fashion. I have been working with the majority; and so far, we have worked out a process which we expect will enable us to support at least seven of the appropriation bills that are coming to the floor.

I had fully expected to stand shoulder to shoulder today with the gentleman from Kentucky, the chairman of the subcommittee, who has done a most thoughtful job in providing necessary oversight for one of the most dysfunctional agencies in this government; and even though he had been given inadequate resources, I had indicated that because of the quality of that oversight I intended to vote for the bill.

That is no longer the case. If this bill is shredded on the floor by points of order made by willful single Members, I will vote against the bill because it will then make no sense whatsoever.

What this action does, in making these provisions subject to a point of order by a single Member, this action puts at risk the thoughtful effort that the committee has put together with respect to securing screening of cargo on passenger airplanes. It puts at risk the funding to ensure that we have a rational terrorist watch match list operation. It puts at risk funding for port security and a number of other items critical to the national defense of the country.

This bill is being eviscerated because of a juvenile, a juvenile, dispute within the Republican caucus about committee jurisdictions. It is what Dick Bolling, my old mentor, used to call dung hill politics, where people put the welfare of their own committee ahead of the welfare of this institution and the welfare of the country. It is little league politics at its worst.

I do not understand how we can be asked on the minority side to sit down and work out a bipartisan agreement on this appropriation bill, and then after we have done so, we are then told that some whiz kid, either in the Committee on Rules or in the leadership's office, has decided that they do not like the compromise and they are going to open it up, to shred it.

The Committee on Homeland Security, the authorization committee that is objecting to some of these provisions in the bill, this is a committee that has existed for 3 years and never put one bill into law. The one bill that has to pass in order to assure this country

adequate security is this bill, the appropriation bill for homeland security; and yet we are going to follow a process today which not only shreds this bill but makes much less likely the prospect that we will finish our regular appropriation bills on time.

If the leadership did not intend to allow this bill to go forward, then why did it even allow it to come up until the authorization committee had gotten off its duff, done its job, completed action on the authorization, so the appropriation committee could then bring the bill to the floor? If the House leadership on the majority side of the aisle did not think it was important enough to pass this bill, then why are we here? Why are we here? Why are we wasting our time?

All this process means is that in the name of jurisdictional purity, the average Member of this House will not have any say whatsoever about the eventual content of the provisions stricken from this bill because those choices will be made behind closed doors, in conference between the two Chambers, out of reach of the average rank-and-file member on both the Committee on Appropriations and the authorization committee. This is a lousy way to run a railroad.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The gentleman makes some very good points about not only his vision and ideas about jurisdictional issues, but I would say to my colleagues today that there is some disappointment on behalf of the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), our great chairman, who worked very diligently, faithfully not only with homeland security but also others in this Congress who are attempting to make sure that Congress not only has a say about the money that is appropriated but an expectation back from the administration and homeland security about the worthiness of what we believe public policy should be. I think this leadership, I think the Committee on Rules last night heard the argument and were very hopeful that we can reach resolution.

Today, we are going to debate this bill. Today, we are going to pass this rule, and we are going to pass this bill, and it is going to empower not only the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) but also the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) to continue, to go back and do their work, to go back, yes, to the table once again with homeland security and to talk about how important it is that the Homeland Security Department provide information on a timely basis.

It is important for us to continue providing reassurance to the American people that the philosophy, that the plans that are in place and moving forward will meet the continuing threat needs against this country.

What I would say is that we are not going to give up on the process. I do

not know that it is perfect. I expressed some reservations myself yesterday in the Committee on Rules about things which I supported, but I believe that our chairman and the ranking member are forthright about their need, their desire to make sure that we will continue working with Department of Homeland Security, even when we have the disagreements. This is a strong sense of the support in Congress that we have for the appropriators to go back and continue to do their work.

So I am proud of what we are doing. I do not think it is a sham. I understand completely why we are here today. I think it will be very clear when we vote today, and it will be a strong signal back to the American public that we intend to be serious about not only the threats that are placed against this country but also those avenues that make sure that our border security continues to provide on a moving-forward basis the ability that we have to meet the threat that is placed against this country.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am not proud what we are doing here today. I mean, this is a sham; and I would say to the gentleman that the choice is clear: you either support the chairman and you either support holding the Department of Homeland Security accountable or you do not.

The way the Committee on Rules came up with this rule, which subjects all these very important provisions to points of order, makes it impossible to hold the Department of Homeland Security accountable. I do not know how anybody who sat in that Committee on Rules meeting last night, all who agreed that what is going on in the Department of Homeland Security right now is very troubling, missing deadlines, not fulfilling requirements that this Congress has asked them to fulfill, I do not know how they could express solidarity with what the chairman and the ranking member were saying and then support a rule like this which undercuts all the accountability. I mean, this is wrong.

Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO), the ranking Democrat on the committee.

Mr. SABO. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

I rise to oppose this rule. Funding government is about money, but it is also about how that money is used. This rule leaves unprotected virtually all of the good government provisions in the homeland security appropriations bill. This rule should be defeated.

What does it do? It leaves unprotected provisions that will increase the screening of air cargo trade on passenger and other aircraft.

If my colleagues think we are doing a good job of screening air cargo on passenger planes today, vote for this rule.

If my colleagues think we should do what Congress has said in increasing screening on air cargo on passenger planes, then vote "no" on this rule.

□ 1100

This rule leaves unprotected a provision that will fund additional explosive detection equipment to check airline passengers and carry-on and checked bags.

This rule leaves unprotected a provision that will ensure that passenger prescreening programs are secure and that the public's vital information is protected.

This rule leaves unprotected provisions to protect taxpayers' dollars from being spent on programs that are not well planned and properly implemented.

This rule leaves unprotected \$84 million for checking airline crews and passengers against the government's terrorist watch list. Is that really what we want to do?

This rule leaves unprotected \$150 million for port security grants.

This rule leaves unprotected a provision to ensure that those managing big government contracts have the proper training to do so. If you believe that the Department of Homeland Security and the Transportation Security Agency are managing contracts with quality and professional management, then vote for the rule. If you believe there are troubles, as indicated by report after report from the Inspector General and the General Accounting Office, then vote "no" on this rule.

This rule leaves unprotected a provision to ensure that only truly sensitive information is designated as such. The Department's current approach permits everyone at TSA to designate any document as sensitive and, therefore, not releasable to the public.

This rule does not allow the Obey amendment to fund the border security requirements of the Intelligence Reform Act and the REAL ID Act.

This rule should be defeated. The subcommittee developed a responsible bill that provided proper and necessary Congressional oversight of critical homeland security programs. This rule allows that oversight to be decimated.

The fact is that the chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), did an outstanding job in developing a bill with proper oversight to present to the House. This rule would allow one-fourth, or a total of 14 pages of this bill, to be deleted.

We are here to conduct serious oversight of the Department of Homeland Security, not simply to rubber stamp the administration's budget request.

I oppose this rule and urge Members to vote against it.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I think we just saw an articulate discussion about how people do need to work together here in Washington and how the ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO), and

our chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), worked together in their desire to make sure that Homeland Security is listening and to make sure it is a collaborative effort. We are going to keep after it. We are going to keep doing the right things that will ensure that the American public understands and gets not only every single dollar's worth, not a penny more, but every single dollar's worth of what is paid for that will secure this country, and that involves the efficiency and effectiveness of Homeland Security.

We had a discussion yesterday about the leadership of Homeland Security; how we know it is brand new, how we know the daunting challenge that is ahead of placing together all of these organizations and making them work well together, having them under the same mission statement and making sure that they are funded properly, making sure we hear back from them, making sure they hear back from us.

Really, what this debate is about today is that we are not sure that Homeland Security is effectively listening to us, the policies that we would intend for them to place before the American public; to implement those and to make sure safety and security is taken care of properly, and then, lastly, the information back that will allow the ranking member and our great chairman a chance to philosophically address those changing parameters and threats against this country.

I believe that this administration will be serious about it. I believe the new leadership of Homeland Security in their wisdom and ability to work more carefully as time moves on will answer these questions and they will provide those things that are necessary.

But we just saw a prime example of the kind of steady hand, proper leadership that exists here in the House of Representatives, and I am proud of that. I am proud of this on both sides of the aisle. I think we will continue working together, and I think that is what this legislation will prove worthy of today.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

This is an incredibly frustrating moment for many Members in this Chamber. The gentleman from Texas talks about the incredible partnership of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the bipartisanship and their desire to hold the Department of Homeland Security accountable and to make sure that we are all protected. Then he is urging that we support a rule that would basically cut all the provisions in the bill that would hold the Department of Homeland Security accountable. He is urging we support a rule that would basically obliterate the bipartisan agreement that we have come to here.

Every Member of this House gets on an airplane probably at least twice a week. And when you look at the state of airline security, when you look at the deadlines that have been missed, when you look at the reports that they have failed to respond to, you have to ask yourself, why are we not doing a better job in holding them accountable and making sure they keep their deadlines?

Again, in the Committee on Rules last night the gentleman from Texas seemed to agree with all these provisions that were in this bill to hold the Department of Homeland Security accountable, and now he is on the floor telling us to support a rule that would strip the bill of all these provisions. It just does not make any sense to me. Why do we not do this right?

We know what has to be done, let us just do it. Instead, you are taking a good bill and you are just tearing it apart, and it just does not make any sense to me. We need to do this right. We cannot afford to get this wrong.

So I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to appreciate the fact that we have a bipartisan bill here, to appreciate the fact that Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member SABO and members of this committee worked tirelessly to make sure we that hold this agency accountable. It needs to be held accountable. Nobody disagrees with that. Do not destroy that by voting for this rule. Vote down this rule and let us go back and report another rule immediately, one that respects the agreement that has been reached here.

Mr. Speaker, I will also be asking Members to oppose the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, I will amend the rule so that we can consider the Obey amendment that was not made in order by the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, the Obey amendment does several things. First, it funds 500 additional border patrol agents, 600 additional immigration investigators, and 4,000 additional detention beds so that the increases called for in the Intelligence Reform Act are fully funded. It also funds the grant program authorizing the REAL ID Act instead of imposing a costly unfunded mandate on our States.

This amendment fully offsets the \$500 million in additional funding for this border enforcement and the REAL ID Act by capping at \$138,176 the tax cut people making over \$1 million this year will receive.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican leadership likes to talk about making this country more secure and about protecting our borders from terrorists, yet they refuse to provide the funds necessary to do this. They also like to brag about how they would never impose an unfunded mandate on States and local governments, yet just 2 weeks ago they did just that.

We have a chance to fix this today by voting for the Obey amendment. It is very disturbing that the Republican

leadership of this House would deny Members an opportunity to vote on an amendment to make Americans safer.

As always, I want to emphasize that a "no" vote will not prevent us from considering the homeland security appropriations bill, but a "no" vote will allow Members to vote on the Obey amendment. However, a "yes" vote will prevent us from adequately protecting our borders and from stopping the major financial burden we are placing on States to implement the REAL ID Act.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment and a description of the amendment immediately prior to the vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. REHBERG). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question so that we would have an opportunity to fully fund protection of the border and urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule.

We had a great opportunity in the Committee on Rules last night to do something good and get it right, and they blew it, so vote "no" on the rule as well.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

We have had a great opportunity to air out our differences today, our hopes and expectations about what we think the brighter and better future will be for the relationship that we have with Homeland Security, and today is part of that process.

I would like to once again reiterate my support for Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member SABO, but I would also like to extend to the members of the Homeland Security Subcommittee my thanks for a job well done. They have spent a lot of time not only traveling around the country, with interaction and meeting with very important people who are focused on a daily basis on our homeland security, and so I want to thank those Republicans who are members of this subcommittee: The gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP), the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM), the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON), the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY), the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD), the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CRENSHAW), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER), and the vice chairman, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK). It has taken a lot of their hard work, along with our friends on the other side of the aisle to make sure that the legislation would get to the floor today.

I would like to congratulate the chairman of the full committee also, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), for his hand in making sure this works.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SESSIONS:

On page 2, line 21, strike “; page 17, lines 21 through 24”.

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

PREVIOUS QUESTION H. RES. 278—RULE FOR H.R. 2360 FY06 HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

“SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, the amendment printed in section 3 shall be in order without intervention of any point of order and before any other amendment if offered by Representative Obey of Wisconsin or a designee. The amendment is not subject to amendment except for pro forma amendments or to a demand for a division of the question in the committee of the whole or in the House.

SEC. 3. The amendment referred to in section 2 is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2360, AS REPORTED (HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS, 2006) OFFERED BY MR. OBEY OF WISCONSIN

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) The amounts otherwise provided in this Act for the following accounts are hereby increased by the following sums:

(1) “Customs and Border Protection—Salaries and Expenses”, \$95,000,000.

(2) “Customs and Border Protection—Construction”, \$25,000,000.

(3) “Immigration and Customs Enforcement—Salaries and Expenses”, \$266,000,000.

(4) “Federal Law Enforcement Training Center—Salaries and Expenses”, \$9,000,000.

(5) “Federal Law Enforcement Training Center—Acquisitions, Construction, Improvements, and Related Expenses”, \$5,500,000.

(b) For the Secretary of Homeland Security to make grants pursuant to section 204 of the REAL ID Act of 2005 (Pub. L. 109-13, div. B) to assist States in conforming with minimum drivers’ license standards, there is hereby appropriated \$100,000,000.

(c) In the case of taxpayers with adjusted gross income in excess of \$1,000,000 for calendar year 2006, the amount of tax reduction resulting from enactment of the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 (Pub. L. 107-16) and the Jobs and Growth Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2003 (Pub. L. 108-27) shall be reduced by 1.562 percent.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on both the amendment and the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question on the amendment and on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the pre-

vious question will be followed by 5-minute votes, if ordered, on the amendment to House Resolution 278 and the adoption of House Resolution 278.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 185, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 174]

YEAS—223

Aderholt	Gibbons	Ney
Akin	Gilchrest	Northup
Alexander	Gillmor	Norwood
Bachus	Gingrey	Nunes
Baker	Goode	Nussle
Barrett (SC)	Goodlatte	Osborne
Bartlett (MD)	Granger	Otter
Barton (TX)	Graves	Oxley
Bass	Green (WI)	Paul
Beauprez	Gutknecht	Pearce
Biggest	Hall	Pence
Bilirakis	Harris	Peterson (PA)
Bishop (UT)	Hart	Petri
Blackburn	Hastings (WA)	Pickering
Blunt	Hayes	Pitts
Boehlert	Hayworth	Platts
Boehner	Hefley	Poe
Bonilla	Hensarling	Pombo
Bonner	Herger	Porter
Bono	Hobson	Price (GA)
Boozman	Hoekstra	Pryce (OH)
Boustany	Hostettler	Putnam
Bradley (NH)	Hulshof	Radanovich
Brady (TX)	Hunter	Ramstad
Brown (SC)	Hyde	Regula
Brown-Waite,	Inglis (SC)	Rehberg
Ginny	Issa	Reichert
Burgess	Istook	Renzi
Buyer	Jenkins	Reynolds
Calvert	Jindal	Rogers (AL)
Camp	Johnson (CT)	Rogers (KY)
Cannon	Johnson (IL)	Rogers (MI)
Cantor	Johnson, Sam	Rohrabacher
Capito	Jones (NC)	Ros-Lehtinen
Carter	Keller	Royce
Castle	Kelly	Ryan (WI)
Chabot	Kennedy (MN)	Ryun (KS)
Chocola	King (IA)	Saxton
Coble	King (NY)	Schwarz (MI)
Cole (OK)	Kingston	Sensenbrenner
Conaway	Kirk	Sessions
Cox	Kline	Shadegg
Crenshaw	Knollenberg	Shaw
Culberson	Kolbe	Shays
Cunningham	Kuhl (NY)	Sherwood
Davis (KY)	LaHood	Shimkus
Davis, Jo Ann	Latham	Shuster
Davis, Tom	LaTourette	Simmons
Deal (GA)	Leach	Simpson
DeLay	Lewis (CA)	Smith (NJ)
Dent	Lewis (KY)	Smith (TX)
Diaz-Balart, L.	Linder	Sodrel
Diaz-Balart, M.	LoBiondo	Souder
Doolittle	Lucas	Stearns
Drake	Lungren, Daniel	Sullivan
Dreier	E.	Tancredo
Duncan	Mack	Taylor (NC)
Ehlers	Manzullo	Terry
Emerson	Marchant	Thornberry
English (PA)	McCaul (TX)	Tiahrt
Everett	McCotter	Tiberi
Feeney	McCrery	Turner
Ferguson	McHenry	Upton
Fitzpatrick (PA)	McHugh	Walden (OR)
Flake	McKeon	Walsh
Foley	McMorris	Wamp
Forbes	Mica	Weldon (FL)
Fortenberry	Miller (FL)	Weldon (PA)
Fossella	Miller (MI)	Weller
Fox	Miller, Gary	Westmoreland
Franks (AZ)	Moran (KS)	Whitfield
Frelinghuysen	Murphy	Wilson (NM)
Galleghy	Musgrave	Wilson (SC)
Garrett (NJ)	Myrick	Wolf
Gerlach	Neugebauer	Young (AK)

NAYS—185

Abercrombie	Berry	Capps
Allen	Bishop (GA)	Capuano
Andrews	Bishop (NY)	Cardin
Baca	Blumenauer	Cardoza
Baldwin	Boren	Carnahan
Barrow	Boswell	Case
Bean	Boyd	Chandler
Becerra	Brown (OH)	Clay
Berkley	Brown, Corrine	Cleaver
Berman	Butterfield	Clyburn

Conyers	Kaptur	Rahall
Cooper	Kennedy (RI)	Rangel
Costa	Kildee	Reyes
Costello	Kind	Ross
Cramer	Kucinich	Rothman
Crowley	Langevin	Roybal-Allard
Cuellar	Lantos	Ruppersberger
Cummings	Larsen (WA)	Rush
Davis (AL)	Lee	Ryan (OH)
Davis (CA)	Levin	Sabo
Davis (FL)	Lewis (GA)	Salazar
Davis (TN)	Lipinski	Sánchez, Linda
DeFazio	Lofgren, Zoe	T.
DeGette	Lowey	Sanchez, Loretta
Delahunt	Lynch	Sanders
DeLauro	Maloney	Schakowsky
Dicks	Markey	Schiff
Doggett	Marshall	Schwartz (PA)
Edwards	Matheson	Scott (GA)
Emanuel	Matsui	Scott (VA)
Engel	McCarthy	Serrano
Eshoo	McCollum (MN)	Sherman
Etheridge	McDermott	Skelton
Evans	McGovern	Smith (WA)
Farr	McIntyre	Snyder
Filner	McKinney	Solis
Ford	McNulty	Spratt
Frank (MA)	Meehan	Stark
Gonzalez	Meek (FL)	Strickland
Gordon	Meeks (NY)	Stupak
Green, Al	Melancon	Tanner
Green, Gene	Menendez	Tauscher
Grijalva	Michaud	Taylor (MS)
Gutierrez	Miller (NC)	Thompson (CA)
Harman	Miller, George	Thompson (MS)
Hastings (FL)	Mollohan	Tierney
Hereth	Moore (KS)	Towns
Higgins	Moore (WI)	Udall (CO)
Hinchey	Moran (VA)	Udall (NM)
Hinojosa	Murtha	Van Hollen
Holden	Nadler	Velázquez
Holt	Napolitano	Visclosky
Honda	Oberstar	Wasserman
Hooley	Obey	Schultz
Hoyer	Oliver	Watson
Inslee	Ortiz	Watt
Israel	Pallone	Waxman
Jackson (IL)	Pascarell	Weiner
Jackson-Lee	Pastor	Wexler
(TX)	Payne	Woolsey
Jefferson	Pelosi	Wu
Johnson, E. B.	Pomeroy	Wynn
Jones (OH)	Price (NC)	

NOT VOTING—25

Ackerman	Doyle	Owens
Baird	Fattah	Peterson (MN)
Boucher	Gohmert	Slaughter
Brady (PA)	Kanjorski	Sweeney
Burton (IN)	Kilpatrick (MI)	Thomas
Carson	Larson (CT)	Waters
Cubin	Millender-	Wicker
Davis (IL)	McDonald	Young (FL)
Dingell	Neal (MA)	

□ 1136

Messrs. BOREN, GORDON, STUPAK and RUSH changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 174, had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. REHBERG). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS).

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as amended.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 222, noes 185, answered “present” 2, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 175]

AYES—222

Aderholt	Gibbons	Northup
Akin	Gilchrest	Nunes
Alexander	Gillmor	Nussle
Bachus	Gingrey	Osborne
Baker	Goode	Otter
Barrett (SC)	Goodlatte	Oxley
Bartlett (MD)	Granger	Paul
Barton (TX)	Graves	Pearce
Bass	Green (WI)	Pence
Beauprez	Gutknecht	Peterson (PA)
Biggert	Hall	Petri
Bilirakis	Harris	Pickering
Bishop (UT)	Hart	Pitts
Blackburn	Hastings (WA)	Platts
Blunt	Hayes	Poe
Boehlert	Hayworth	Pombo
Boehner	Hefley	Porter
Bonilla	Hensarling	Price (GA)
Bonner	Herger	Pryce (OH)
Bono	Hobson	Putnam
Boozman	Hoekstra	Radanovich
Boustany	Hostettler	Ramstad
Bradley (NH)	Hulshof	Regula
Brady (TX)	Hunter	Rehberg
Brown (SC)	Hyde	Reichert
Brown-Waite,	Inglis (SC)	Renzi
Ginny	Issa	Reynolds
Burgess	Jenkins	Rogers (AL)
Buyer	Jindal	Rogers (KY)
Calvert	Johnson (CT)	Rogers (MI)
Camp	Johnson (IL)	Rohrabacher
Cannon	Johnson, Sam	Ros-Lehtinen
Cantor	Jones (NC)	Royce
Capito	Keller	Ryan (WI)
Carter	Kelly	Ryun (KS)
Castle	Kennedy (MN)	Saxton
Chabot	King (IA)	Schwarz (MI)
Chocola	King (NY)	Sensenbrenner
Coble	Kingston	Sessions
Cole (OK)	Kirk	Shadegg
Conaway	Kline	Shaw
Cox	Knollenberg	Shays
Crenshaw	Kolbe	Sherwood
Culberson	Kuhl (NY)	Shimkus
Cunningham	LaHood	Shuster
Davis (KY)	Latham	Simmons
Davis, Jo Ann	LaTourette	Simpson
Davis, Tom	Leach	Smith (NJ)
Deal (GA)	Lewis (CA)	Smith (TX)
DeLay	Lewis (KY)	Sodrel
Dent	Linder	Souder
Diaz-Balart, L.	LoBiondo	Stearns
Diaz-Balart, M.	Lucas	Sullivan
Dicks	Lungren, Daniel	Tancred
Doolittle	E.	Taylor (NC)
Drake	Mack	Terry
Dreier	Manzullo	Thomas
Duncan	Marchant	Thornberry
Ehlers	McCaul (TX)	Tiahrt
English (PA)	McCotter	Tiberi
Everett	McCrery	Turner
Feeney	McHenry	Upton
Ferguson	McHugh	Walden (OR)
Fitzpatrick (PA)	McKeon	Walsh
Flake	McMorris	Wamp
Foley	Mica	Weldon (FL)
Forbes	Miller (FL)	Weldon (PA)
Fortenberry	Miller (MI)	Weller
Fossella	Miller, Gary	Westmoreland
Fox	Moran (KS)	Whitfield
Franks (AZ)	Murphy	Wilson (NM)
Frelinghuysen	Musgrave	Wilson (SC)
Gallegly	Myrick	Wolf
Garrett (NJ)	Neugebauer	Young (AK)
Gerlach	Ney	

NOES—185

Abercrombie	Boren	Cleaver
Allen	Boswell	Clyburn
Andrews	Boyd	Conyers
Baca	Brown (OH)	Cooper
Baldwin	Brown, Corrine	Costa
Barrow	Butterfield	Costello
Bean	Capps	Cramer
Becerra	Capuano	Crowley
Berkley	Cardin	Cuellar
Berman	Cardoza	Cummings
Berry	Carnahan	Davis (AL)
Bishop (GA)	Case	Davis (CA)
Bishop (NY)	Chandler	Davis (FL)
Blumenauer	Clay	Davis (TN)

DeFazio	Lewis (GA)	Rothman
DeGette	Lipinski	Roybal-Allard
Delahunt	Lofgren, Zoe	Ruppersberger
DeLauro	Lowey	Rush
Doggett	Lynch	Ryan (OH)
Edwards	Maloney	Sabo
Emanuel	Markey	Salazar
Engel	Marshall	Sánchez, Linda
Eshoo	Matheson	T.
Etheridge	Matsui	Sanchez, Loretta
Evans	McCarthy	Sanders
Farr	McCollum (MN)	Schakowsky
Filner	McDermott	Schiff
Ford	McGovern	Schwartz (PA)
Frank (MA)	McIntyre	Scott (GA)
Gonzalez	McKinney	Serrano
Gordon	McNulty	Sherman
Green, Al	Meehan	Skelton
Green, Gene	Meek (FL)	Slaughter
Grijalva	Meeks (NY)	Smith (WA)
Gutierrez	Melancon	Snyder
Harman	Menendez	Solis
Hastings (FL)	Michaud	Spratt
Herseeth	Miller (NC)	Stark
Higgins	Miller, George	Strickland
Hinche	Mollohan	Stupak
Hinojosa	Moore (KS)	Tanner
Holden	Moore (WI)	Tauscher
Holt	Moran (VA)	Taylor (MS)
Hooley	Murtha	Thompson (CA)
Hoyer	Nadler	Thompson (MS)
Inslee	Napolitano	Tierney
Israel	Norwood	Towns
Jackson (IL)	Oberstar	Udall (CO)
Jackson-Lee	Obey	Udall (NM)
(TX)	Olver	Van Hollen
Jefferson	Ortiz	Velázquez
Johnson, E. B.	Pallone	Visclosky
Jones (OH)	Pascarell	Wasserman
Kaptur	Pastor	Schultz
Kennedy (RI)	Payne	Watson
Kildee	Pelosi	Watt
Kind	Peterson (MN)	Waxman
Kucinich	Pomeroy	Weiner
Langevin	Price (NC)	Wexler
Lantos	Rahall	Woolsey
Larsen (WA)	Rangel	Wu
Lee	Reyes	Wynn
Levin	Ross	

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—2

Emerson

Istook

NOT VOTING—24

Ackerman	Doyle	Neal (MA)
Baird	Fattah	Owens
Boucher	Gohmert	Scott (VA)
Brady (PA)	Honda	Sweeney
Burton (IN)	Kanjorski	Waters
Carson	Kilpatrick (MI)	Wicker
Cubin	Larson (CT)	Young (FL)
Davis (IL)	Millender-	
Dingell	McDonald	

□ 1151

So the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2360 and that I may include tabular material on the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. REHBERG). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 278 and rule

XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2360.

□ 1153

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2360) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, with Mr. GILLMOR in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MIKE ROGERS) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MIKE ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am pleased to be here today to present the fiscal 2006 Homeland Security Appropriations bill.

The first chapter for the Department of Homeland Security has been written. Progress has been made, and our country is safer today than it was before September 11. In 2 years the Department has developed and deployed new technologies to inspect cargo at our seaports and detect hazards in our environment. US-VISIT has been put in place at all international airports and seaports; a one-stop shop for first responders has been created; more than 90,000 national assets have been catalogued in a national infrastructure database; and a communications system with State and local governments is in place.

These are important accomplishments, but they are not enough. There is a great deal of work to be done, and it is time to write the next chapter.

The bill before us today provides \$30.8 billion in discretionary funds for the upcoming fiscal year, \$1.4 billion above the current year and \$1.3 billion above the amounts requested by the President. There are some tough choices in here, but they have been made after a careful review of how the Department is functioning, which programs work, and which ones, quite frankly, are broken.

Nearly 2 years ago, when the Department was first created and came before the Committee on Appropriations seeking funds, I made it clear that homeland security requires the active engagement of all Americans and all branches of government; that we are all stakeholders and must be treated as such. I also advised that the Committee on Appropriations would be a partner as the Department sought to secure our homeland, that we would not be casual bystanders willing to sign a blank check. I have consistently